

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated August 17, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing remarks are made in response thereto. Claims 1, 3, and 19-21 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification and specifically in paragraph 69. No prohibited new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

**I. Summary of the Office Action.**

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-17 and 19-21 are pending. Claims 5-17 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis.
3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Ellsworth *et al.*
4. No claims are allowed.

**II. Response to the Office Action.**

**1. Claim rejections: Indefiniteness**

The Examiner has rejected claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly indefinite for lacking proper antecedent basis. Claims 20-21 have been amended to identify “the FGF-18” instead of “the composition”. Because the term has proper antecedent basis, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**3. Claim rejections: Ellsworth *et al.***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Ellsworth *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Ellsworth *et al.* discloses infusion of Fibroblast Growth Factor 18 (FGF-18) in a rat model for stroke. Ellsworth *et al.* is limited to studies in rat. The amended claims are drawn to methods of enhancing memory, attentive cognition or learning in human or treating

impaired cognition in human. Because Ellsworth *et al.* does not teach administration of FGF 18 to humans, Ellsworth *et al.* does not anticipate the amended claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**III. Conclusion.**

Applicants believe that the above-referenced application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and early notice of allowance to that effect is respectfully requested.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Director is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application, including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3250, reference No. 17357.01202US. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-835-7553.

Respectfully submitted,

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP

  
Einar Stole  
Reg. No. 47,272

Dated: January 17, 2008

**Customer No. 00038647**  
**Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP**  
International Square Building  
1850 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel. No. (202) 835-7553  
Fax No. (202) 835-7586